

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. The above amendment is being made to comply with a requirement of form expressly set forth in the final Office Action dated December 25, 2006 ("final Office Action"). The presented amendment is also necessary to present the claims in better condition for allowance, and was not presented earlier because it was not until after receiving the final Office Action that the Examiner's interpretation of the claims was clear.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3, 14, 15, and 17 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claims 4-13, 16, and 18 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview with Applicant's representatives, Tracy Durkin and Matt Rozier, on February 12, 2007. The claim rejections were discussed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks reflect the substance of the interview with the Examiner. Entry of these amendments and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 13-15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication 2001/0008475 to Takagi et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features from claim 7 that the member forming the load beam portion has a hollow opening, and that the reinforcing structure is in the form of a flange structure provided at left and right symmetrical internal sides of the member forming the load beam portion, the internal sides defining the hollow opening.

As noted by the Examiner on pages 7-8 of the final Office Action, Takagi does not disclose a magnetic head suspension wherein the reinforcing structure is in the form of a flange structure provided at left and right symmetrical internal sides of the member forming the load beam portion, the internal sides defining the hollow opening.

Claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1 and contain at least the features recited therein. Claims 13 and 18 have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-12 as being "product by process" claims entitled to no weight in determining patentability. Claims 10-12 have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 10-16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2003/0193752 to Takahashi et al. in view of Takagi.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to include the features from claim 7 that the member forming the load beam portion has a hollow opening, and that the reinforcing structure is in the form of a flange structure provided at left and right symmetrical internal sides of the member forming the load beam portion, the internal sides defining the hollow opening.

As noted by the Examiner on pages 7-8 of the final Office Action, neither Takahashi nor Takagi, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a magnetic head suspension wherein the reinforcing structure is in the form of a flange structure provided at left and right symmetrical internal sides of the member forming the load beam portion, the internal sides defining the hollow opening.

Claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1 and contain at least the limitations recited therein. Claims 4-6, 10-13, 16, and 18 have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-9 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. In response, all limitations of claim 7 have been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 7, 8 and 9 have been cancelled.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Tracy-Gene G. Durkin
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,831

Date: March 5, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

648408_1.DOC